	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 08-13555 (JMP)
4	Case No. 08-01420 (JMP)(SIPA)
5	Adv. Case No. 09-01032
6	x
7	In the Matter of:
8	
9	LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS, INC., et al.
10	
11	Debtors.
12	x
13	In the Matter of:
14	
15	LEHMAN BROTHERS, INC.,
16	
17	Debtor.
18	x
19	In the Matter of:
20	LBSF,
21	Plaintiff,
22	v.
23	BALLYROCK ABD CDO 2007-1 Limited, et al.,
24	Defendants.
25	x

```
Page 2
1
2
                     U.S. Bankruptcy Court
3
                     One Bowling Green
                     New York, New York
4
5
6
                     August 21, 2013
7
                     10:10 AM
8
9
    BEFORE:
10
    HON JAMES M. PECK
11
    U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Page 3 1 Hearing re: Motion for Approval of Partial Settlement 2 Agreements Relating to Certain Credit Default Swap 3 Agreements and Indentures [ECF No. 38757] 4 5 Hearing re: LBSF v. Ballyrock ABD CDO 2007-1 Limited and 6 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Trustee [Case No. 09-01032], Motion to Compel Barclays Bank, PLC, Long Island International 7 8 Limited for the Production of Documents 9 10 Hearing re: Motion of Fidelity National Title Insurance 11 Company to Compel Compliance with Requirements of Title 12 Insurance Policies [ECF No. 11513] 13 Hearing re: Motion of Giants Stadium LLC for Leave to 14 15 Conduct Discovery of LBI Pursuant to Federal Rule of 16 Bankruptcy Procedure 2004 [ECF No. 36874] 17 Hearing re: Motion of RBC Dominion Securities Inc. to Compel 18 Lehman Brothers Holdings, Inc. to Reissue Checks for Allowed 19 20 Claim [ECF No. 39062] 21 Hearing re: Motion of FirstBank Puerto Rico for (1) 22 23 Reconsideration, Pursuant to Section 502(j) of the 24 Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 9024, of the SIPA 25 Trustee's Denial of FirstBank's Customer Claim, and (2)

Page 4 Limited Intervention, Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 7024 and 1 2 Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1, in the Contested Matter 3 Concerning the Trustee's Determination of Certain Claims of 4 Lehman Brothers Holdings, Inc. and Certain of Its Affiliates 5 [LBI ECF No. 5197] 6 7 Hearing re: Trustee's Eighty-Second Omnibus Objection to General Creditor Claims (No Liability Claims) [LBI ECF No. 8 9 6373] 10 Hearing re: Trustee's Eighty-Fifth Omnibus Objection to 11 12 General Creditor Claims (Amended and Superseded Claims) [LBI 13 ECF No. 6426] 14 15 Hearing re: Trustee's Eighty-Seventh Omnibus Objection to 16 General Creditor Claims (No Liability Claims) [LBI ECF No. 17 6556] 18 Hearing re: Trustee's Eighty-Eighth Omnibus Objection to 19 20 General Creditor Claims (No Liability Claims) [LBI ECF No. 21 6566] 22 23 Hearing re: Trustee's Ninety-Fifth Omnibus Objection to 24 General Creditor Claims (No Liability Claims) [LBI ECF No. 25 6682]

Page 5 1 2 Hearing re: Trustee's Ninety-Seventy Omnibus Objection to General Creditor Claims (No Liability Claims) {LBI ECF No. 3 4 6684] 5 6 Hearing re: Trustee's Ninety-Eighth Omnibus Objection to 7 General Creditor Claims (No Liability Claims) [LBI ECF No. 8 6699] 9 Hearing re: Trustee's Objection to General Creditor Proof 10 11 of Claim of Riverside Holdings, L.L.P. (Claim No. 9004770) 12 [LBI ECF No. 6389] 13 14 Hearing re: Trustee's One Hundred First Omnibus Objection 15 to General Creditor Claims (Employee Equity Claims) [LBI ECF 16 No. 6728] 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Transcribed by: Pamela A. Skaw

	Page 6
1	APPEARANCES:
2	WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP
3	Attorneys for Debtor
4	767 Fifth Avenue
5	New York, NY 10153-0119
6	
7	BY: RICHARD W. SLACK, ESQ.
8	CANDANCE M. ARTHUR, ESQ.
9	
10	CHAPMAN AND CUTLER, LLP
11	Attorney for U.S. Bank National Association as Trustee
12	111 West Monroe Street
13	Chicago, IL 60603
14	
15	BY: FRANKLIN H. TOP, III, ESQ.
16	
17	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
18	Attorneys for Black Rock Mortgage
19	787 Seventh Avenue
20	New York, NY 10019
21	
22	BY: NICHOLAS CROWELL, ESQ.
23	ALEX J. KAPLAN, ESQ.
24	
25	

Page 7 SULLIVAN & CROMWELL, LLP Attorney for Barclays Capital Inc. and Long Island International LLC 125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004 BY: ROBINSON B. LACY, ESQ. ALSO APPEARING: H.D. CHRISTIAN (TELEPHONIC)

Page 8 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: All right. Be seated, please. 3 MS. ARTHUR: Good morning. THE COURT: Good morning. 4 5 MS. ARTHUR: Good morning, Your Honor. For the 6 record, Candace Arthur of Weil, Gotshal & Manges on behalf 7 of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. as plan administrator. 8 Your Honor, as reflected on the agenda, the first 9 matter before the Court today is the plan administrator's 10 motion on behalf of itself and Lehman Brothers Special Financing, Inc., which I'll refer to LBSF moving forward, 11 12 seeking approval of five partial settlement agreements. 13 Each of the agreements, in and of themselves, resolve disputes relating to credit default swap 14 15 transactions. 16 Your Honor, before discussing the substance of the 17 relief requested in the motion, I would like to note for the 18 Court that although the agenda lists the motion under contested matters, it is the plan administrator's position 19 20 that the objecting noteholder, Canyon Value Realization Fund 21 LP is essentially opting out of one of the five settlement 22 agreements and is not objecting to the relief requested in 23 the motion. 24 Effectively, the motion before the Court today is 25 actually uncontested and the noteholder is specifically

requesting to be carved out of the Axim (ph) Ridge CBO 2007
1 settlement agreement, pursuant to the terms provided in

the agreement for those noteholders that are objecting to

the terms of the settlement.

By way of background, Your Honor, each settlement agreement is among LBHI, LBSF, the U.S. Bank National Association, solely in its capacity as Trustee under certain indentures, and the various entities referenced in the motion as either issuer or a co-issuer.

Each settlement agreement will allow LBSF to capture a substantial amount of the value of these transaction and the notes that it owns for its estate.

Given that we have come before the Court to seek approval of very similar settlement agreements, I realize that the Court is familiar with the terms of the agreements themselves, but to just briefly highlight the salient points.

The issuer and the trustee shall redeem or otherwise liquidate the collateral held in their position and deposit the net proceeds for later distribution in accordance with order priority and procedures set forth in the respective settlement agreements. The proceeds are to be used to satisfy any outstanding fees and expenses of the trustee to pay each noteholder, other than LBSF, that does not object to the settlement, an amount specified in the

agreement in full satisfaction of their claims. Create an interest bearing account in a set amount reserved for certain of the trustee's fees and expenses. Create an escrow amount securing payment of the claims of any objecting noteholder and, subject to certain conditions, to pay the remaining amount of proceeds to LBSF.

Of the notes that LBSF does not hold, it agrees that it will not assert it is entitled to be paid on a senior or power to sue basis with such notes. LBSF has, however, reserved its right to assert that it is entitled to be paid certain amounts owed under the notes that it owns on a junior basis, to those notes it does not own, in a certain amount.

Although the terms of each settlement agreement are virtually identical, each agreement is separate from the other and the amounts that are placed in the reserve or escrow accounts will be separate for each of the five transactions and the conditions to effect (indiscernible - 00:03:18) agreements, may actually vary as well.

Your Honor, it is the plan administrator's

position that each of the settlement agreements were entered

into in good faith and negotiated at arm's length.

Additionally, we believe that each of the five agreements

are fair and equitable, well within the range of

reasonableness and are in the best interests of LBSF's

estate and its creditors.

Unless the Court has any questions, the debtors respectfully request entry of an order approving the motion.

THE COURT: My principal question probably can't be answered on the public record and may require a chambers conference.

The motions, the supporting papers, the declarations, even the positions filed by U.S. Bank National Association in support of all of their efforts to notify noteholders are opaque as it relates to the economics of the transaction and the benefits to the estate.

And so even though you characterize this as uncontested, I don't have any information concerning the actual benefit to the estate associated with the proposed settlements. I'm perfectly prepared to approve them but will need some more information.

In the past, unredacted copies of settlement agreements have been furnished to chambers. We couldn't find such materials. I don't know if they were delivered or not, but they weren't brought to my attention. And so I'm going to need to speak with representatives of both the debtors and U.S. Bank, if U.S. Bank wishes to participate, so that I'm provided with the information I need to better understand what's going on here.

MS. ARTHUR: We understand. I do have extra

copies of the settlement agreements. We provided the United States Trustee, counsel for the creditors committee, and chambers copies of the settlement agreements on August 14th. However, I do agree that, to the extent that Your Honor doesn't have the economics, that it would probably be in the best interests for us to meet and discuss it and provide you with a copy to review as well.

THE COURT: Okay. My suggestion then and I'll hear from counsel for U.S. Bank in the moment. I see that he's standing. My suggestion is that we complete the public portion of the hearing, including the status conference with respect to Ballyrock, and then simply go off the record and clear the courtroom to the extent appropriate so that I can then be advised as to what's going on with regard to this motion for partial settlement.

And there'll be no need for further on the record presentations. I treat the papers as supporting approval.

I simply need to know more so that I can confirm that I'm going to enter an order approving this.

MS. ARTHUR: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Pause)

MR. TOP: Your Honor, Frank Top on behalf of U.S. Bank National Association as trustee for five of these cash hybrid transactions that are before this Court today.

In fact, these settlements will fully resolve

three, if not four, of the transactions entirely. So, while it's been characterized as partial, that was to enable noteholders to opt out of the settlement if they so chose -- choose to do so. While we heard from a number of noteholders with respect to the resolution, only one noteholder advised the trustee that they had an objection and that was the Axim 2007-1 transaction.

I subsequently learned that he may have another position in another one of these transactions. He only directed us to file an objection on one. I'm not sure whether he even has that position or whether he intended to object with respect to the other ones. That's another thing that I would like to determine.

But that doesn't affect the (indiscernible - 00:07:47) or anything like that. At worst, all they'd become is an objecting noteholder and it's governed by the terms of the settlement agreement and reserves are going to be held with respect to all objecting noteholders. That's if they ultimately prevail in the litigation, they would be paid their principal and interest, in full.

THE COURT: Your objection on behalf of the noteholder does not provide any grounds for the objection. It simply states that there is an objection. I -- are you aware of any grounds for the objection?

MR. TOP: The only ground for the objection is

Page 14 1 that they were not happy with the settlement amount, which 2 is their prerogative. They don't have to accept the amount. 3 They can choose not to accept it and they just become an 4 objecting noteholder and are subject to mediation, 5 litigation or whatever. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And -- I won't ask more 7 questions about it. That's fine. Thank you. 8 MR. TOP: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: So is there anyone else who wishes to 10 be heard with regard to this motion for approval of a 11 partial settlement? 12 (Pause) 13 THE COURT: I'm going to treat the record as 14 closed with the understanding that certain information 15 relating to the economics of the settlement will be provided 16 to me privately, consistent with the confidential nature of 17 various aspects of the settlement. 18 But unless I hear something that would cause me to question the business judgment of the debtors in entering 19 20 into these arrangements, for record purposes, these are all 21 going to be approved and I will enter an order subject to my 22 being provided with the information off the record. 23 We can move on to the next matter. 24 (Pause) 25 MR. SLACK: Good morning, Your Honor.

Richard Slack from Weil, Gotshal for the debtors.

The next matter, as Your Honor pointed out, is the Ballyrock status conference. You had asked the parties to get together and discuss two things. One is whether the action overall can be settled and the second is whether there is a way of resolving the privilege motion that had been brought.

The parties have done both and I can talk to both of those. So, with respect to the settlement piece, at Your Honor's urging the parties have met and have actually had very productive settlement discussions that are ongoing.

THE COURT: Good.

MR. SLACK: With respect to the privilege motion, we've also had simultaneous discussions and there have been a number of creative proposals that have been exchanged and the parties are working through those. I'm optimistic that we can and will reach an agreement on it. But we haven't yet.

THE COURT: When you say you're optimistic that you can reach an agreement on it --

MR. SLACK: On the --

THE COURT: -- do you mean to say that there may be a consensual resolution of all of the issues that were briefed and argued or are you saying that you're optimistic that the issues before the Court will be, in some fashion,

streamlined or limited?

MR. SLACK: I believe that if the proposals we're talking about now get agreed to in some fashion that they will resolve the motion entirely at this point.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. SLACK: So -- and I really don't want to go through the discussions. Obviously, there might be some things that are deferred but I think the motion would be withdrawn is my understanding as to how our discussions are going right now.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll give Mr. Lacy an opportunity to comment, if he wishes to. But I'm interested just for docket control purposes and understanding what the likely timing is both with respect to a comprehensive resolution to the extent that's feasible and this more narrow question involving discovery.

MR. SLACK: I'm not sure that it's something that I can address in terms of timing, at least as to the overall settlement. The parties are still discussing and having discussions and, as I've said, they've been productive. But I wouldn't venture a guess as to whether they're going to stall or whether they're going to keep moving. I don't really have a crystal ball on that.

With respect to the privilege motion, we have presented a proposal, a fairly detailed proposal, recently

Pg 17 of 24 Page 17 1 to counsel for Barclays and Black Rock and, again, I'm 2 optimistic because we've had some prior discussions and we 3 tried to be true to those discussions. So, we'll -- I 4 assume we'll be getting some kind of a response to that in 5 the near future and hopefully it will be a positive one and 6 that can move more quickly. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 8 Does anyone else wish to say anything? 9 (Pause) 10 MR. LACY: Your Honor, Robinson Lacy from Sullivan & Cromwell for Barclays Capital and Long Island 11 12 International. 13 I am in general agreement with everything Mr. Slack has said. I do want to clarify that -- you'll 14 15 recall that Your Honor's suggestion concerning the motion to 16 compel involved trying to -- I think you said de-mist the 17 issue of the timing of the petitions and you had observed 18 that a certain amount was known and I think you at least understood that a certain amount could be determined by 19 20 testimony. 21 The discussions we're having concerning the privilege motion would, I think, totally resolve the other 22 23 branch, which is the motion to compel production of

documents concerning the structuring of the transactions,

things that happened in 1997.

24

Whether or not it will resolve the branch having to do with the timing depends on what people say. And we don't know what they're going to say yet. So at least some of them are going to be LBSF's witnesses.

So I don't -- I'm not quite as optimistic as

Mr. Slack that the entire motion would get resolved as a

result of these procedures. But they will certainly make -
we will certainly accomplish a great deal if we can get this

worked out.

THE COURT: Accomplish as much as you can.

(Pause)

MR. CROWELL: Good morning, Your Honor.

Nick Crowell from Sidley Austin for Black Rock.

I generally agree with what Mr. Slack said as well. We have made progress as far as the global resolution of the case with respect to my client. However, the only thing I will add is that, as far as I know, the negotiations between, at least, my client and Lehman have stalled at this point. So I'm hoping that they will pick back up again.

But at this point, they have stalled. So I just wanted to make the Court aware of that.

THE COURT: Okay. Before you step away, this is just a general question. I take it that the conversations relating to what we're terming a global resolution are happening directly and that -- do not involve mediation, at

the moment?

MR. CROWELL: My understanding is they're happening directly between business people from my client and from Lehman. That is correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And I'm just going to ask a question more generally for the parties who've been involved in these conversations, as to whether it would be productive to return to mediation or is sufficient progress being made despite the fact that there's a current stall, that the parties believe that they're capable of moving the process forward through their own efforts.

MR. CROWELL: I would put that question to Mr. Slack. I hope so, but I would put that question to him.

MR. LACY: Your Honor, I'll say that because it's

-- because these negotiations are conducted by business

people, it tends to be sort of one defendant at a time. So

sometimes we don't hear anything and Mr. Crowell's client is

talking. Sometimes he doesn't hear anything, and my client

is talking.

I think this week is my client's time to talk and I think that's probably the sense of stalling that he's getting. But the discussions are, in fact, going on actively with Barclays. I don't think a mediator would be able to contribute anything at this stage.

THE COURT: Okay. So --

Pg 20 of 24 Page 20 1 MR. SLACK: I mean, Your Honor, the only thing 2 I --3 THE COURT: -- everybody's a little bit in the dark it seems. 4 5 MR. SLACK: No, the only thing I would add is that 6 my understanding is that the negotiations are ongoing with 7 both parties and so I'm surprised to hear that the negotiations have stalled. That's not my understanding 8 9 coming in. But we had had a global meeting and then, Your 10 Honor, the principals have essentially been talking. And 11 again I think they've been productive. 12 But the lawyers, I assume, are all getting reports 13 but have not been directly involved and so I think that's 14 the -- you know, that's been the process that we've had. I 15 can tell you from the debtors' standpoint that if these were 16 to stall, we would -- we've found mediation to be helpful in 17 many circumstances, as Your Honor knows. 18 What I would say here is that I think, right now, the negotiations are proceeding quicker outside of mediation 19 20 because in order for us to set a mediation date with our 21 very busy mediators would be sometime in the future. So I wouldn't want to stop in order to do that. And if they do 22 23 stall, that's something I would certainly be willing to 24 discuss with both parties.

MR. LACY: I completely agree with that position.

THE COURT: Okay. I only brought up the issue of mediation in part because of the reference to the discussions having stalled and I'm now understanding that it may simply be that the discussions are not entirely visible to counsel.

MR. CROWELL: That may be the case, Your Honor. But I think it's more likely what Mr. Lacy said, which is that perhaps it's Barclays week and not my client's week.

(Laughter)

THE COURT: Okay. And I take no position on whether it's desirable for these conversations to be happening separately as opposed to collectively and I presume that people are acting in a way that fits their respective schedules and their views as to how to deal with these difficult questions as productively as possible from a business perspective. I do not want to intrude on that at all.

However, I do wish to have some docket control over this and will ask even now for some guidance as to when you think it would be reasonable for there to be a follow up report concerning progress and status -- 30 days, 45 days, 60 days?

MR. CROWELL: I would prefer a shorter period of time, say 30 days, at least for my client.

MR. SLACK: That's acceptable, Your Honor. We car

certainly report back at the next omnibus.

MR. LACY: That is also our preference.

THE COURT: Okay. Fine.

So, why don't we do this? This doesn't need to be on the record if you're still satisfied that you're making good progress. And my recollection is that during the Ballyrock mediation, which took place a number of years ago, we had a process of periodic telephonic status reports. I don't think I'm confusing Ballyrock with another case, but it's possible.

Mr. Lacy, do you recall that -- that we --

MR. LACY: It wasn't during the mediation. It was during the pendency of the motion to dismiss. But that is correct. We had -- I think every two or three weeks, we were having telephone calls.

THE COURT: We had periodic discussions in which we didn't in any way discuss the substance of the negotiations that were ongoing, but I was being provided with information concerning the ongoing discussions and whether or not progress was being made. And maybe we can adopt the same general approach now and have a telephone conference in approximately 30 days that you can arrange directly with my law clerks, at a time that works for everybody. And the timing on this is approximate. It doesn't need to be exactly 30 days. It may turn out to be

Page 23 1 35 days, or 26 days. It doesn't matter. But that's the 2 general time frame. 3 MR. LACY: Fine. That works. MR. SLACK: Certainly that works. 4 THE COURT: Okay. And then if there's a 5 6 breakdown, or there's a need for putting anything on the 7 record, we can always schedule that. 8 All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate the 9 update. 10 (Chorus of thank you) 11 THE COURT: And then I'm going to suggest that everybody here who's involved in Ballyrock, other than 12 13 Mr. Slack, who's certainly welcome to stay, will be excused and then we're going to go off the record and have a 14 conversation about the details of the settlement discussed 15 16 earlier this morning. 17 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:34 AM) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 24 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Pamela A. Skaw, certify that the foregoing transcript is 4 a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 6 7 Pamela A Digitally signed by Pamela A Skaw DN: cn=Pamela A Skaw, o, ou, email=digital1@veritext.com, Skaw c=US Date: 2013.08.22 17:16:57 -04'00' 9 10 11 Veritext 12 200 Old Country Road 13 Suite 580 14 Mineola, NY 11501 15 16 17 Date: August 22, 2013 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25